

REMARKS

Prior to the Office Action, claims 1-38 were pending in this application. Of these claims 35-38 were previously withdrawn; they remain so. In this response, claims 1, 10, and 26 are amended. Claims 35- 38 remain withdrawn. Claims 1-38 are still pending. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments and arguments set forth fully below.

Interview

Applicants Attorney interviewed with Supervisory Patent Examiner Michael Barr on March 19, 2007. Registered Patent Agent Jaime Ashander was also present. Applicants thank Examiner Barr for granting the interview and for the constructive criticism he provided.

Election

Applicants confirm that election was made without traverse.

Formalities

Applicants submit that the reference numbers 246 on and 237, on page 4 lines 29 and 30 respectively, are correct inasmuch as they refer to FIG. 2.

The above amendment to the specification corrects the informality noted on page 8.

Claim Rejections

Within the Office Action, the examiner rejected claims 1-34.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 10-13, 15, 18-20, 30-32, and 34 stand rejected under 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 3,646,948 to Athey. The applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is moot in view of the claim amendments above.

Athey discloses a washing machine chamber with parts and conduits externally mounted to the chamber to provide a circulation loop. There is no teaching, hint or suggestion to provide an integrally formed circulation loop as set forth fully in claims 1 or 10, or an integrally formed fluid communication line, as set forth fully in claim 26, within Athey.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-34 also stand rejected under 103(a) as obvious over US Patent No. 6,848,458 to Shrinivasan in view of US Patent No. 4,730,630 to Ranft. The applicants respectfully submit that

this rejection is moot in view of the claim amendments above.

Ranft discloses a washing machine chamber with parts and conduits externally mounted to the chamber to provide a circulation loop. Shrinivasan discloses a supercritical processing system. There is no teaching, hint or suggestion to provide an integrally formed circulation loop as set forth fully in claims 1 or 10, or an integrally formed fluid communication line, as set forth fully in claim 26, within any of Shrinivasan, Ranft, or their combination.

In addition, claims 1-34 stand rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,596,093 to DeYoung, also in view of Ranft. The applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is moot in view of the claim amendments above.

As mentioned above, Ranft discloses a washing machine chamber with parts and conduits externally mounted to the chamber to provide a circulation loop. DeYoung discloses a supercritical processing system. There is no teaching, hint or suggestion to provide an integrally formed circulation loop as set forth fully in claims 1 or 10, or an integrally formed fluid communication line, as set forth fully in claim 26, within any of DeYoung, Ranft, or their combination.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is amended as provided above. As stated earlier, the totality of the limitations of amended claim 1 are not taught, nor are they even suggested by Athey. Further, the combination of Shrinivasan and Ranft does not disclose, nor does it even suggest, every limitation of the amended claim 1. In addition, the combination of DeYoung and Ranft does not disclose, nor does it even suggest, every limitation of the amended claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the references cited, either alone or in the cited combinations, including Athey, Ranft, DeYoung, Shrinivasan, DeYoung in view of Ranft, and Shrinivasan in view of Ranft.

Claims 2-9

Claims 2-9 are dependent on claim 1. As stated above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Thus, claims 2-9 are patentable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 10

Claim 10 is amended as provided above. As stated earlier, the totality of the limitations of amended claim 10 are not taught, nor are they even suggested by Athey. Further, the combination of Shrinivasan and Ranft does not disclose, nor does it even suggest, every limitation of the amended claim 10. In addition, the combination of DeYoung and Ranft does not disclose, nor does it even suggest, every limitation of the amended claim 10.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 10 is patentable over the references cited, either alone or in the cited combinations, including Athey, Ranft, DeYoung, Shrinivasan, DeYoung in view of Ranft, and Shrinivasan in view of Ranft.

Claims 11-25

5 Claims 11-25 are dependent on claim 10. As stated above, claim 10 is allowable over the cited references. Thus, claims 11-25 are patentable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 26

10 Claim 26 is amended as provided above. As stated earlier, the totality of the limitations of amended claim 26 are not taught, nor are they even suggested by Athey. Further, the combination of Shrinivasan and Ranft does not disclose, nor does it even suggest, every limitation of the amended claim 10. In addition, the combination of DeYoung and Ranft does not disclose, nor does it even suggest, every limitation of the amended claim 26.

15 For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 26 is patentable over the references cited, either alone or in the cited combinations, including Athey, Ranft, DeYoung, Shrinivasan, DeYoung in view of Ranft, and Shrinivasan in view of Ranft.

Claims 27-34

20 Claims 27-34 are dependent on claim 26. As stated above, claim 26 is allowable over the cited references. Thus, claims 27-34 are patentable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

25 For the above reasons, Applicants submit that claims 1-34 are patentable over the cited references. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

30 Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

35 By: 

Thomas B. Haverstock
Reg. No.: 32,571
Attorneys for Applicants

Dated: 3-22-07

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR § 1.8(a))
I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP.

Date: 3/22/07 